

REMARKS

The following presentation is intended to comply with 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and respond to rejection of the claimed invention as presented by the examiner.

1. A novel and unobvious method of forming two phases one of sugars and one of insoluble acid is a procedure for separating sugars from a hydrolysate is presented.
2. Doubtless, if the elements within the prior art are combined, the references would fall short of amended claim 1, within the present invention.
3. Prior art references, cited by the examiner, lack motivation to be combined (expressed or implied) so as to produce results of the present invention.
4. Prior art references cited is deficient of any suggestion that modification will result in features claimed within amended claim 1 of the present invention.
5. Prior art references, cited by the examiner, are individually complete and functional, so reason or motivation to employ parts, add or combine these teachings is lacking.
6. The results achieved by the invention are new and substantially different from references cited by the examiner, to be considered obvious.
7. The fact that multiple references must be combined to achieve results is evidence that the present invention is both novel and unobvious.
8. Applicants invention within the present application, as amended, solves a problem different from a combination of teachings of the prior art. This result was established by judgment within *in re Wright, 6 USPQ 2d 1959 (1988)*.
9. Consideration of a prior art search resulted in filling the present application and provides evidence that prior art was evaluated and determined to be inapplicable.
10. Regarding prior art references, cited by the examiner, this prior art was found to be groundless within the present application.
11. The invention claims a principle of operation previously unfulfilled and so the applicant has blazed a trail rather than following one.